

Two Remarks on Marcinkiewicz decompositions by Holomorphic Martingales

Paul F.X. Müller
Department of Mathematics
J. Kepler Universität
A-4040 Linz, AUSTRIA

October 11, 1993

1 Introduction

The real part of $H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ is not dense in $L^\infty_{\mathbf{R}}(\mathbb{T})$. The John-Nirenberg theorem in combination with the Helson-Szegö theorem and the Hunt Muckenaupt Wheeden theorem has been used to determine whether $f \in L^\infty_{\mathbf{R}}(\mathbb{T})$ can be approximated by $\operatorname{Re} H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ or not: $\operatorname{dist}(f, \operatorname{Re} H^\infty) = 0$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and any interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{T}$.

$$|\{x \in I : |\tilde{f} - (\tilde{f})_I| > \lambda\}| \leq |I|e^{-\lambda/\epsilon},$$

where $\tilde{f}$ denotes the Hilbert transform of f . See [G] p. 259. This result is contrasted by the following

Theorem 1 *Let $f \in L^\infty_{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is a function $g \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and a set $E \subset \mathbb{T}$ so that $|\mathbb{T} \setminus E| < \epsilon$ and*

$$f = \operatorname{Re} g \quad \text{on } E.$$

This theorem is best regarded as a corollary to Men'shov's correction theorem. For the classical proof of Men'shov's theorem see [Ba, Ch VI §1-§4]. Simple proofs of Men'shov's theorem – together with significant extensions – have been obtained by S.V. Khrushchev in [Kh] and S.V. Kislyakov in [K1], [K2] and [K3].

In [S] C. Sundberg used $\bar{\partial}$ -techniques (in particular [G, Theorem VIII.1. gave a proof of Theorem 1 that does not mention Men'shov's theorem.

The purpose of this paper is to use a Marcinkiewicz decomposition on Holomorphic Martingales to give another proof of Theorem 1. In this way we avoid uniformly convergent Fourier series as well as $\bar{\partial}$ -techniques.

Holomorphic Martingales enter in the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *There exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ so that for every $f \in \operatorname{BMOA}$, where $\|f\| \leq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^+$ there exists $g \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $E \subset \mathbb{T}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_\infty &\leq \lambda \\ |f(\theta) - g(\theta)| &\leq \epsilon \quad \text{on } E \\ |\mathbb{T} \setminus E| &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\lambda c_1 c_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider complex Brownian Motion $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the Wiener space $(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$. A complex valued random variable X on Ω is called holomorphic if the conditional expectation

$$X_t = \mathbf{E}(X | \mathcal{F}_t)$$

admit a stochastic integral representation of the form $X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t F_s dz_s$, where F_s is adapted to $\mathcal{F}_s$.

$H^p(\Omega)$ denotes the closure in $L^p(\Omega)$ of holomorphic random variables. $\text{BMO}(\Omega)$ denotes the closure of holomorphic random variables under the norm

$$\sup_t \|\mathbf{E}(|X - X_t| | \mathcal{F}_t)\|_\infty.$$

The connection to analytic functions is provided by operators M, N so that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^p(\mathbb{T}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & H^p(\mathbb{T}) \\ M & \searrow & \nearrow N \\ & H^p(\Omega) & \end{array}$$

where $\|M\|_p = \|N\|_p = 1$ and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{BMOA}(\mathbb{T}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Id}} & \text{BMOA}(\mathbb{T}) \\ M & \searrow & \nearrow N \\ & \text{BMO}(\Omega) & \end{array}$$

where $\|M\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C_0, \|N\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq C_0$.

These probabilistic ideas have a quite long history and were useful in several problems of Analysis. See [F], [G-S], [Ma] and [V].

2 Proofs of the results

Proof of Lemma 2. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \inf\{t : |z_t| > 1\} \\ \tau &= \inf\{t \leq \sigma : |f(z_t)| > \lambda\} \\ G_t &= f(z_{t \wedge \tau}) \\ F_t &= f(z_t) \\ g(\theta) &= N(G)(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_\infty &\leq \lambda \\ g &\in H^\infty \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\theta : |f - g| > \epsilon\}| &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|f - g\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|N(F - G)\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

By [M, Lemma 1] we get

$$\|N(F - G)\|_1 \leq \|F - G\|_1 \leq 2 \int_{\{F^* > \lambda\}} |F| dP$$

where $F^* = \sup |F_t|$. By Cauchy-Schwartz we obtain

$$\int_{\{F^* > \lambda\}} |F| dP \leq \{F^* \geq \lambda\}^{1/2} c_2 \leq e^{-\lambda c_1} c_2,$$

because $F \in \text{BMO}(\Omega)$ implies $\mathbf{E}e^{F^*c} < \infty$. This implies the estimate

$$|\{\theta : |g - f| > \epsilon\}| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\lambda c_1} c_2.$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Given $\epsilon > 0$ we select $\lambda_n \in \mathbf{R}^+$ so that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n c_1} c_2 2^n < \epsilon$$

and

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n 2^{-n} < \infty.$$

Then given a function $h : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ and $\delta > 0$ we define

$$T_\delta(h)(\theta) = \begin{cases} h(\theta) & \text{if } |h(\theta)| \leq \delta \\ \delta & \text{if } |h(\theta)| \geq \delta \end{cases}$$

Now consider $u_0 \in L_{\mathbf{R}}^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ with $\|u_0\|_\infty = 1$ and let $\tilde{u}_0$ be the Hilbert transform of u_0 then $u_0 + i\tilde{u}_0 \in \text{BMOA}$ and

$$\|u_0 + i\tilde{u}_0\|_{\text{BMOA}} \leq C\|u_0\|_\infty.$$

We next apply an iteration procedure from [S].

Step 1. Use Lemma 2 to obtain $E_1 \subset \mathbb{T}$, $g_1 \in H^\infty$ with $\|g_1\|_\infty \leq \lambda_1$ so that

$$|u_0 + i\tilde{u}_0 - g_1| < 1/2 \quad \text{on } E_1$$

and

$$|\mathbb{T} \setminus E_1| \leq 2e^{-\lambda_1 c_1} c_2.$$

Induction Step. We have already constructed $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1} \in L_{\mathbf{R}}^\infty$, $g_1, \dots, g_n \in H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $E_1, \dots, E_n \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ so that for $j \leq n$

$$\|g_j\|_\infty \leq \lambda_j 2^{-j}$$

$$|u_{j-1} + i\tilde{u}_{j-1} - g_j| \leq 2^{-j} \quad \text{on } E_j$$

$$|\mathbb{T} \setminus E_j| \leq e^{-c_1 \lambda_1} c_2 2^j.$$

Now we let

$$u_n := T_{2^{-n}}(u_{n-1} - \text{Re } g_n)$$

and we have

$$u_n = u_{n-1} - \text{Re } g_n \quad \text{on } E_n$$

$$\|u_n\|_\infty \leq 2^{-n}.$$

By Lemma 2 we find $g_{n+1} \in H^\infty(D)$, $E_{n+1} \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ so that

$$\|g_{n+1}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_{n+1} 2^{-n-1},$$

$$|u_n + i\tilde{u}_n - g_{n+1}| \leq 2^{-n-1} \quad \text{on } E_{n+1},$$

$$|\mathbb{T} \setminus E_{n+1}| \leq e^{-c_1 \lambda_{n+1}} c_2 2^{n+1}.$$

Having completed the construction we set

$$g := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g_j$$

which defines an element in $H^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. Tracing back we see that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Re} g_n \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$$

or

$$u_0 = \operatorname{Re} g \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n.$$

It remains to estimate $|\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n|$ from below:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \right| &\geq |\mathbb{T}| - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{T} \setminus E_n| \\ &\geq |\mathbb{T}| - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n c_1} 2^n c_2 \\ &\geq |\mathbb{T}| - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

3 A Refinement of Lemma 2

In the above argument we gave just an estimate for the **size** of the set

$$\{\theta : |f(\theta) - g(\theta)| < \epsilon\}$$

but did not give any indication where to find this set. A more detailed analysis of the “conditional expectation” operator N gives estimates which relate the probabilistic Marcinkiewicz decomposition to classical maximal functions.

Let $h : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ be a function, then let $h^\#$ be the non tangential maximal function and define

$$M_{HL}(h)(\theta) := \sup_I \int_I |h| \frac{dt}{|I|}$$

where the sup is taken over intervals in $\mathbb{T}$ which contain θ . Let g be defined as in the proof of Lemma 2 then we have the pointwise estima

Theorem 3 1. $|f(\theta) - g(\theta)| \leq C(|f(\theta)| + \lambda)M_{HL}(\chi_{H_\lambda})(\theta)$ whe $H_\lambda = \{f^\# > \lambda\}$.

2. Let $f \in BMO$, with $\|f\| \leq 1$, then for every $N > 0$ there exists $\lambda > 0$ and $B \subset \{\theta \in \mathbb{T} : |f(\theta)| \leq N\}$ so that

$$|\mathbb{T} \setminus B| \leq e^{-Nc_1}c_2,$$

$$M_{HL}(\chi_{H_\lambda})(\theta) \leq e^{-\lambda c_3} \quad \text{for } \theta \in B.$$

PROOF. ad 1. For $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $z \in D$ let

$$P_\theta(z) := \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|e^{i\theta} - z|^2}.$$

Fix $0 < r < 1$ consider the stopping times

$$\sigma_r := \inf\{t : |z_t| > r\}$$

and let

$$F_\lambda := \{\omega \in \Omega : \tau(\omega) < \sigma(\omega)\}$$

$$E_\lambda := \{z \in D : |f(z)| > \lambda\}$$

where the stopping time τ has been defined during the proof of Lemma 2. Then for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ we have (using formula (1) in [Du, Section 3,2])

$$\begin{aligned} g(\theta) &= N(F - G)(\theta) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}((f(z_{\sigma_r}) - f(z_{\sigma_r \wedge \tau}))P_\theta(z_r)) \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}((f(z_{\sigma_r}) - f(z_{\sigma_r \wedge \tau}))\chi_{F_\lambda}P_\theta(z_r)) \\ &\leq (|f(\theta)| + \lambda) \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}(\chi_{F_\lambda}P_\theta(z_{\sigma_r})). \end{aligned}$$

For $A \subset D$ let

$$\omega(A) := \mathbf{P}\{z_t \in A, \text{ for some } t < \sigma\}.$$

Then $\omega(E_\lambda) = \mathbf{P}(F_\lambda)$ and by the strong Markov Property we have: (see [D], p. 923 or [V], p. 112)

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}(\chi_{F_\lambda}P_\theta(z_{\sigma_r})) = \int_{\partial E_\lambda} P_\theta(z)\omega(dz).$$

The integral on the RHS is called balayage or sweep of $\omega|_{\partial E_\lambda}$ and has been much studied because of its relation to Carleson-measures and BMO. See [G], pp. 229, 239 and 240. The argument in [G], p. 239 gives the estimate

$$\int_{\partial E_\lambda} P_\theta(z) \omega(dz) \leq C_3 \sup_{0 \leq h < 1} \frac{\omega(\partial E_\lambda \cap S_h)}{h}$$

where

$$S_h := \{re^{i\psi} : 1-h \leq r < 1, |\psi - \theta| \leq h\}.$$

The result of Burkholder Gundy Siverstein gives for every harmonic function $u : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$

$$\omega\{u > \lambda\} \leq C|\{u^\# > \lambda\}|.$$

See [P], p. 36. Therefore by [G, Lemma I.5.5] ω is a Carleson Measure.

Hence a simple stopping time argument gives for every $0 \leq h \leq 1$

$$\omega(\partial E_\lambda \cap S_h) \leq C|\{f^\# > \lambda\} \cap 3I_h|$$

where $I_h = S_h \cap \mathbb{T}$. We therefore have the estimate.

$$\int_{\partial E_\lambda} P_\theta(z) \omega(dz) \leq C \sup_{0 \leq h \leq 1} \frac{|\{f^\# > \lambda\} \cap 2I_h|}{h}$$

And by choice of I_h the LHS is dominated by

$$CM_{HL}(\chi_{H_\lambda})(\theta)$$

where $H_\lambda = \{\psi \in \mathbb{T} : f^\#(\psi) > \lambda\}$.

ad 2. As $f \in \text{BMO}$ there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ so that for each $\lambda > 0$

$$|\{f^\# > \lambda\}| \leq e^{-\lambda\delta_0} C_0.$$

Now choose $\delta_1 = \delta_0/2$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \{f^\# > \lambda\} \\ G &= \{|f| < N\} \\ \mathcal{J} &= \{I \subset \mathbb{T} : |H \cap I| > e^{-\lambda\delta_1} |I|, I \text{ Intervall}\} \\ J &= \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{J}} I \\ B &= G \setminus J. \end{aligned}$$

The weak type 1 : 1 bound for the Hardy Littlewood maximal function gives

$$|J| \leq |H|e^{\lambda\delta_1}C \leq e^{-\lambda\delta_1}C.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{T} \setminus B| &\leq |\mathbb{T} \setminus G| + |J| \\ &\leq e^{-N\delta_0}C_0 + e^{-\lambda\delta_1}C. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by definition, we have

$$M_{HL}(\chi_H)(\theta) \leq e^{-\lambda\delta_1} \text{ for } \theta \in B$$

and this completes the proof. ■

References

- [Ba] Bary N.K., A Treatise on Trigonometric Series, Pergamon Press (1964).
- [B-G-S] Burkholder D.L., Gundy R.F., Silverstein M.L., A maximal function Characterisation of the class H^p , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 157 (1971), 137–153.
- [D] Davis B., Brownian Motion and analytic Functions, Annals. of Prob. 7 (1979), 913–932.
- [Du] Durrett R., Brownian Motion and Martingale in Analysis, The Wadsworth Mathematical Series (1984).
- [F] Föllmer H., Stochastic Holomorphy, Math. Ann. 207 (1974), 245–255.
- [G] Garnett J.B., Bounded analytic Functions, Academic Press, (1981).
- [G-S] Gettoor R.K., Sharpe M.J., Conformal Martingales, Inv. Math. 16 (1972), 271–308.
- [Kh] Khrushchev S.V., Men'shov's correction theorem and Gaussian processes, Proc. of Steklov Institute of Math. 155 (1983), 147–175, (Engl. Transl.).
- [K1] Kislyakov S.V., The Fourier Coefficients of the boundary Values of Functions analytic in the Disk and in the Bidisk, Proc. of Steklov Institute of Math. 155 (1983), 75–91, (Engl. Transl.).
- [K2] Kislyakov S.V., Quantitative aspects of correction theorems, Zap. Nauch. Sem. Leningrad, Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov (LOMI) 92 (1979), 182–191.
- [K3] Kislyakov S.V., A new correction theorem, Math. USSR Izvestiya 24 (1985) 283–305 (Engl. Transl.).
- [M] Müller P.F.X., Holomorphic Martingales and Interpolation between Hardy Spaces, appears in Jour. d'Analyse Math. (Jerusalem).

- [Ma] Maurey B., Isomorphismes entre espaces H^1 , Acta Math. 145 (1980), 79–120.
- [P] Petersen K.E., Brownian Motion, Hardy Spaces and Bounded mean Oscillation, L.M.S. Lecture Note Series, 28, Cambridge University Press (1977).
- [S] Sundberg C., Truncation of BMO Functions, Ind. Univ. Math. J. 33 (1984), 749–771.
- [V] Varopoulos N.Th., The Helson Szegő Theorem and A_p -Functions for Brownian Motion and Several Variables, Jour. of Funct. Anal. 39 (1980), 85–121.